



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/820,964

03/30/2001

Lev Brouk

ODVFP009A

3907

22434

7590

03/30/2009

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

P.O. BOX 70250

OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2452

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/820,964	Applicant(s) BROUK ET AL.	
	Examiner PHILIP C. LEE	Art Unit 2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-8 and 15-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-8 and 15-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on February 03, 2009.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/3/09 has been entered.
3. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 15-26 are presented for examination and claims 4 and 9-14 are canceled.
4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action.

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zombek et al, U.S. Patent 6,704,768 (hereinafter Zombek).

8. As per claim 17, Zombek taught the invention as claimed for authenticating services participating in routing of a message in a message routing network (col. 21, lines 39-47), comprising:

before the routing of the message in the message routing network:

authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network (col. 21, lines 39-42);

associating an identifier with the enterprise when the enterprise is authenticated to the message routing network (col. 21, lines 39-42);

authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider (col. 21, lines 43-47);

associating the identifier with an account of the enterprise when the enterprise is

authenticated to the first service provider, such that the identifier represents

authentication of the first service provide to the enterprise account (col. 21, lines 43-47);

such that when a message including said identifier is received from a sender of the message, authentication of only said message routing network using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message (col. 21, lines 32-53).

9. As per claim 18, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Zombek further taught wherein the sender of the message is the enterprise (col. 21, lines 39-42).

10. As per claim 19, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Zombek further taught wherein the sender of the message is the first service provider (col. 32, line 60-col. 33, line 2).

11. As per claim 20, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Zombek further taught wherein said identifier is a message routing network ID (col. 22, lines 26-29).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

12. Claim 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zombek in view of Shiozawa, U.S. Patent Application Publication 20010005358 (hereinafter Shiozawa).

13. Zombek and Shiozawa were cited in the previous office action.

14. As per claim 1, Zombek taught the invention substantially as claimed for routing a message (col. 4, lines 36-39) between services in a message routing network, comprising:

before routing the message in the message routing network, associating an identifier with an entity that has been authenticated by said message routing network(col. 21, lines 39-42);

before routing the message in the message routing network, associating said identifier with an account of the entity upon authentication of said entity with a first service that supports said entity account, such that the identifier represents authentication of the first service to the entity account (col. 21, lines 43-47);

receiving, from a second service, a message including said identifier, said message being directed to a mapped service (e.g. MR) (col. 20, lines 47-52; col. 21, lines 6-13), wherein said mapped service is an entity account-specific representation of said first service (col. 21, lines 39-53) (i.e. MR represents the service type of the BES or server application) and acts as a proxy for said first service (i.e. MR acts as proxy between the BES network with BES executed application and the client network with client application) (fig. 1c; col. 22, lines 50-65);

authenticating only said message routing network using said identifier included in said message (col. 21, lines 32-53); and when said message routing network is authenticated using said identifier (col. 21, lines 32-53; col. 22, lines 4-10; col. 24, lines 49-50) and translating, by said message routing network, said message for delivery to said first service (col. 32, lines 46-50; col. 32, line 66-col. 33, line 2), wherein said translated

Art Unit: 2452

message includes said identifier (col. 20, lines 47-52) and is directed from said mapped service to said first service (col. 21, lines 32-53; col. 22, lines 22-29).

15. Zombek does not teach determine whether a route for a message needs to be modified. Shiozawa taught a mapped service is operable to determine whether a route for a message needs to be modified prior to delivering the message to a destination (page 5, paragraphs 73-76); and the mapped service determines that said route for the message does not need to be modified, the message is delivered to the destination (page 5, paragraphs 72 and 73).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Shiozawa because Shiozawa's teaching of determining whether a route for a message needs to be modified would increase the reliability of Zombek's and Short's systems by allowing restoration of data transmission in case of fault occurrence without undesired reduction in efficiency on the use of network bandwidth (page 1, paragraphs 1 and 9).

17. As per claim 2, Zombek and Shiozawa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further taught wherein said identifier is a message routing network ID (col. 22, lines 26-29).

Art Unit: 2452

18. As per claim 3, Zombek and Shiozawa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2 above. Zombek further taught wherein said identifier is a message routing network ID for said mapped service (col. 22, lines 26-29).

19. As per claim 5, Zombek and Shiozawa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further taught wherein said translating comprises adding an identifier of said entity account to said message (col. 15, lines 26-33).

20. As per claim 6, Zombek and Shiozawa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further taught wherein upon receipt of said translated message, said first service associates said identifier with said entity account based on a mapping internal to said first service (col. 22, lines 26-29, 51-59).

21. As per claim 7, Zombek and Shiozawa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further taught comprising receiving a second message from said first service, said second message being directed to said mapped service (col. 24, lines 49-56).

22. As per claim 8, Zombek and Shiozawa taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 7 above. Zombek further taught comprising translating said second message for delivery to said second service (col. 32, lines 66-col. 33, lines 2).

23. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroux et al U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0243574 (hereinafter Giroux) in view of Zombek.

24. Giroux was cited in the last office action.

25. As per claim 15, Giroux taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

providing a proxy service ((e.g., ASP server, 160, fig. 3) for messages transferred between a first application service provider (110, fig. 3) and a second application service provider (120, fig. 3) in a message routing network (page 3, paragraph 53) (i.e., ASP server 160 providing a proxy service for transferring data from ASP server 110 to ASP server 120), said first application service provider and said second application service provider providing application services (page 1, paragraph 6)

26. Giroux did not specifically teach authentication. Zombek taught before routing the messages in the message routing network, providing an identifier associated with an entity that has been authenticated by said message routing network (col. 21, lines 39-42);

before routing the messages in the message routing network, associating said identifier with an account of the entity upon authentication of said entity with said first application service provider, such that the identifier represents authentication of the first application service provider to the entity account (col. 21, lines 42-47);

receiving, from said second application service, a message including said identifier, said message being directed to said proxy service (col. 20, lines 47-52; col. 21, lines 6-13), wherein

Art Unit: 2452

said proxy service is an entity account-specific representation of said first application service (col. 21, lines 39-53) (i.e. MR represents the service type of the BES or server application); authenticating only said message routing network using said identifier included in said message (col. 21, lines 32-52); and when said message routing network is authenticated using said identifier (col. 21, lines 32-52; col. 22, lines 4-10; col. 24, lines 49-50), translating, by said message routing network, said message for delivery to said first application service col. 32, lines 46-50; col. 32, line 66-col. 33, line 2), wherein said translated message includes said identifier (col. 20, lines 47-52) and is directed from said proxy service to said first application service (col. 21, lines 32-53; col. 22, lines 22-29).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Giroux and Zombek because Zombek's teaching of authentication would increase the security of Giroux's system by preventing message from unauthorized user to access the system.

28. As per claim 16, Giroux and Zombek taught the invention substantially as claimed as in claim 15 above. Zombek further taught wherein said proxy service adds an account identifier to a message that is transmitted to said second application service provider (col. 15, lines 26-33).

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Giroux and Zombek for the same reason as set forth in claim 15 above.

30. Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zombek in view of Sandhu et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 20080052775 (hereinafter Sandhu).

31. As per claim 21, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Zombek did not teach providing the identifier to the first service provider. Sandhu taught wherein authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider includes providing the identifier to the first service provider ([0061]).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Sandhu because Sandhu's teaching of providing the identifier to the first service provider would improve the security of Zombek's system by providing additional authentication at the service provider level.

33. As per claim 22, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Zombek did not teach providing a provisioning token to the first service provider. Sandhu taught wherein authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider includes providing a provisioning token to the first service provider ([0061]).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Sandhu because Sandhu's teaching of

Art Unit: 2452

providing provisioning token to the first service provider would improve the security of Zombek's system by providing additional authentication at the service provider level.

35. As per claim 23, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Zombek did not teach providing a confirmation indicating authentication of the enterprise. Sandhu taught providing a confirmation message to the message interchange network indicating authentication of the enterprise to the first service provider ([0113] and [0156]).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Sandhu because Sandhu's teaching of providing a confirmation indicating authentication of the enterprise would improve the security of Zombek's system by providing additional authentication at the service provider level.

37. As per claim 24, Zombek and Sandhu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23 above. Sandhu further taught wherein the confirmation message includes the identifier ([0113] and [0156]).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Sandhu for the same reason as claim 23 above.

Art Unit: 2452

39. As per claim 25, Zombek and Sandhu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23 above. Sandhu further taught wherein the confirmation message includes the provisioning token ([0113] and [0156]).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Sandhu for the same reason as claim 23 above.

41. As per claim 26, Zombek and Sandhu taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23 above. Sandhu further taught designating a time period for receipt of the confirmation message, a provisioning token expiring after passage of the time period ([0113] and [0156]).

42. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek and Sandhu for the same reason as claim 23 above.

43. Applicant's arguments filed 02/03/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

44. In the remarks, applicant argued that:

(1) Zombek fails to teach authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network and authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider.

45. In response to point (1), Zombek teaches device address is check against a local cache of authorized devices or a MR DB of authorized devices (col. 21, lines 39-42) (i.e., authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network). Zombek further teach if the device address is an authorized client device, and the customer is check for permission rights to the requested service type provided by the Back end server (col. 21, lines 43-47) (i.e., authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider).

46. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on (571) 272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2452

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip C Lee/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452